Sen. Fulbright and the News

We have a group, including many Right Question, but Wrong And your readers, which meets bis swers"—just like another schoolboy, regardless of his prodigious mind.

Pasadena, who now ask: "Is The We still believe there should be the second of the street o Times becoming a pro-Fulbright fol-

News items on Page 1 on July 29. and 30 seem to verify this accusation. Toni Lambert quotes Sen. Ful-bright's acceptance of an apology from CIA Director Helms—and then remarks that he (Sen. Fulbright)

We are inclined to believe that everything the senator says or does, demonstrates a selfish motive, rather than a 'magnanimous' one.

The senator has proven this too often by his 'rabble-rousing' public-ly. As Ernest Conine says in his co-lumn (July 27) "Fulbright Poses the

more attention and credit given to the warning predictions of the late. Gen. MacArthur regarding the necessity of our defense bastions on; the islands of Formosa, Okinawa, and the Philippines, and their connection with an undeclared war in Vietnam.

It certainly is a foregone conclusion that the Chinese Reds and their Viet Cong ally, would sweep around; that vulnerable corner to take pos-session of these islands, in event they were successful in the current Vietnam struggle. Then—as Gen. MacArthur said: — "Where would that leave us?" Behind the proverbi-al 'eight ball. Why doesn't Sen Fulbright admit this catastrophic possibility?

WILLIAM WALLACE, Los Angeles.

The Times is not a "Fulbright-follower." We simply report the facts.—Ed.